

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA (Western Division – Los Angeles)
CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 2:18-cv-04969-CBM-JEM**

Mark Hezinger v. United States Attorneys Office for the Central
District of California et al
Assigned to: Judge Consuelo B. Marshall
Referred to: Magistrate Judge John E. McDermott
Cause: 05:552 Freedom of Information Act

Date Filed: 06/04/2018
Jury Demand: None
Nature of Suit: 895 Freedom of
Information Act
Jurisdiction: U.S. Government Defendant

Plaintiff

Mark Hezinger

represented by **Mark Hezinger**
4319 Price Street No. 4
Los Angeles, CA 90027
310-699-2417
Email: integralmark@gmail.com
PRO SE

V.

Defendant

**United States Attorneys Office for the
Central District of California**

represented by **Alarice M Medrano**
AUSA – Office of US Attorney
Civil Division
300 North Los Angeles Street Suite 7516
Los Angeles, CA 90012
213-894-0460
Fax: 213-894-7819
Email: alarice.medrano@usdoj.gov
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Defendant

National Security Division

represented by **Alarice M Medrano**
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Defendant

Department of Justice

represented by **Alarice M Medrano**
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Defendant

Federal Bureau of Investigation

represented by **Alarice M Medrano**
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Defendant

Department of Homeland Security

represented by **Alarice M Medrano**
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Defendant

represented by

Los Angeles Police Department
TERMINATED: 10/05/2018

Arlene Nancy Hoang
 Los Angeles City Attorneys Office
 200 N. Main St
 Room 675
 Los Angeles, CA 90012
 213-978-7508
 Fax: 213-978-7011
 Email: arlene.hoang@lacity.org
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Date Filed	#	Docket Text
06/04/2018	<u>1</u>	COMPLAINT against Defendants Department of Homeland Security, Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Los Angeles Police Department, National Security Division, United States Attorneys Office for the Central District of California. Case assigned to Judge Consuelo B. Marshall for all further proceedings. Discovery referred to Magistrate Judge John E. McDermott. (Filing Fee \$ 400 PAID), filed by Plaintiff Mark Hezinger. (Additional attachment(s): # <u>1</u> Civil Cover Sheet) (lh). (Entered: 06/07/2018)
06/04/2018	<u>2</u>	60 DAY Summons Issued re Complaint – (Discovery), <u>1</u> as to Defendant United States Attorneys Office for the Central District of California. (lh) (Entered: 06/07/2018)
06/04/2018	<u>3</u>	CERTIFICATION AND NOTICE of Interested Parties filed by Plaintiff Mark Hezinger, (lh) (Entered: 06/07/2018)
06/04/2018	<u>4</u>	NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT to District Judge Consuelo B. Marshall and Magistrate Judge John E. McDermott. (lh) (Entered: 06/07/2018)
06/07/2018	<u>5</u>	STANDING ORDER by Judge Consuelo B. Marshall: READ THIS ORDER CAREFULLY. IT CONTROLS THIS CASE AND MAY DIFFER IN SOME RESPECTS FROM THE LOCAL RULES. (see document for further details) (bm) (Entered: 06/07/2018)
06/13/2018	<u>6</u>	APPLICATION for Pro Se Litigant to electronically file documents in a specific case filed by plaintiff Mark Hezinger. (bm) (Entered: 06/14/2018)
06/15/2018	<u>7</u>	ORDER by Judge Consuelo B. Marshall: granting <u>6</u> APPLICATION for Pro Se Electronic Filing. The applicant must register to use the Courts CM/ECF System within five (5) days of being served with this order. Registration information is available at the Pro Se Litigant E-Filing web page located on the Courts website. Upon registering, the applicant will receive a CM/ECF login and password that will allow him/her to file non-sealed documents electronically in this case only. Any documents being submitted under seal must be manually filed with the Clerk. (bm) (Entered: 06/15/2018)
07/11/2018	<u>8</u>	SUBMISSION BY PLAINTIFF OF PROOF OF SERVICE TO ALL DEFENDANTS filed by Plaintiffs in Pro Per Mark Hezinger.(ab) (Entered: 07/12/2018)
07/27/2018	<u>9</u>	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION to Dismiss for Lack of Jurisdiction <i>and</i> , NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION to Dismiss Case filed by Defendant Los Angeles Police Department. Motion set for hearing on 9/4/2018 at 10:00 AM before Judge Consuelo B. Marshall. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Memorandum of points and authorities in support of motion to dismiss, # <u>2</u> Proposed Order) (Attorney Arlene Nancy Hoang added to party Los Angeles Police Department(pty:dft)) (Hoang, Arlene) (Entered: 07/27/2018)
07/27/2018	<u>10</u>	CERTIFICATE of Interested Parties filed by Defendant Los Angeles Police Department, identifying City of Los Angeles. (Hoang, Arlene) (Entered: 07/27/2018)
08/24/2018	<u>11</u>	REQUEST FOR EXTENSION filed by plaintiff Mark Hezinger. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Proposed Order) (bm) (Entered: 08/24/2018)
08/27/2018	<u>12</u>	MINUTES IN CHAMBERS– ORDER GRANTING REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO RESPOND [DKT. NO. 11] AND CONTINUING HEARING by Judge Consuelo B. Marshall granting <u>11</u> REQUEST for Extension of Time to File: The

		matter before the Court is Plaintiff's request for an extension of time to file an opposition to Defendant Los Angeles Police Department's motion to dismiss. (Dkt. No. 11.) The request is GRANTED. The hearing on Defendant's motion to dismiss (Dkt. No. 9) is hereby continued to October 2, 2018 at 10:00 a.m. Plaintiff shall file his opposition no later than September 11, 2018. Defendant shall file its reply no later than September 18, 2018. (bm) (Entered: 08/27/2018)
08/31/2018	<u>13</u>	PROOF OF SERVICE Executed by Plaintiff Mark Hezinger, upon Defendants served on 8/31/2018, answer due 10/30/2018. Service of the Summons and Complaint were executed upon the United States Attorneys Office by unspecified means. Executed upon the Attorney Generals Office of the United States by delivering a copy to not indicated. Executed upon the officer agency or corporation by delivering a copy to not indicated. Service was executed in compliance with statute not specified. Due diligence declaration NOT attached. Registered or certified mail return receipt attached. Original Summons NOT returned. (bm) (Entered: 09/04/2018)
09/10/2018	<u>14</u>	MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES in Opposition to NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION to Dismiss for Lack of Jurisdiction <i>and</i> filed by Plaintiff Mark Hezinger. (yl) (Entered: 09/11/2018)
09/10/2018	<u>15</u>	PROOF OF SERVICE filed by Plaintiff Mark Hezinger. The Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Opposition to Motion for Defendant LAPD to Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint (Entered: 09/11/2018)
09/14/2018	<u>16</u>	EX PARTE APPLICATION filed by plaintiff Mark Hezinger. (bm) : # <u>1</u> Proposed Order) (bm). (Entered: 09/14/2018)
09/14/2018	<u>17</u>	MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF EX PARTE APPLICATION <u>16</u> filed by Plaintiff Mark Hezinger. (bm) (Entered: 09/14/2018)
09/14/2018	<u>18</u>	PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL filed by plaintiff Mark Hezinger, re EX PARTE APPLICATION <u>16</u> , MEMORANDUM in Opposition to Motion <u>17</u> , served on 9/14/18. (bm) (Entered: 09/14/2018)
09/17/2018	<u>19</u>	OPPOSITION re: EX PARTE APPLICATION for Order <u>16</u> filed by Defendant Los Angeles Police Department. (Hoang, Arlene) (Entered: 09/17/2018)
09/17/2018	<u>20</u>	REPLY in support of NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION to Dismiss for Lack of Jurisdiction <i>and</i> NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION to Dismiss Case <u>2</u> filed by Defendant Los Angeles Police Department. (Hoang, Arlene) (Entered: 09/17/2018)
09/20/2018	<u>21</u>	EX PARTE APPLICATION to Extend Time to File Answer to 10/30/2018 re Complaint – (Discovery),, <u>1</u> filed by Federal Defendants Department of Homeland Security, Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, National Security Division, United States Attorneys Office for the Central District of California. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Proposed Order) (Attorney Alarice M Medrano added to party Department of Homeland Security(pty:dft), Attorney Alarice M Medrano added to party Department of Justice(pty:dft), Attorney Alarice M Medrano added to party Federal Bureau of Investigation(pty:dft), Attorney Alarice M Medrano added to party National Security Division(pty:dft), Attorney Alarice M Medrano added to party United States Attorneys Office for the Central District of California(pty:dft)) (Medrano, Alarice) (Entered: 09/20/2018)
09/26/2018	<u>22</u>	MINUTES IN CHAMBERS– ORDER DENYING EX PARTE APPLICATION [DKT. NO. 16] WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO PLAINTIFF'S FILING A REGULARLY NOTICED MOTION by Judge Consuelo B. Marshall denying <u>16</u> EX PARTE APPLICATION: Accordingly, Plaintiff's ex parte application is denied without prejudice to his filing a regularly noticed motion addressing the same topic. Plaintiff is also advised that there is a federal pro se clinic available to help pro se litigants with various matters relating to federal litigation. Information is available at: http://prose.cacd.uscourts.gov/los-angeles . (see document for further details) (bm) (Entered: 09/26/2018)
09/27/2018	<u>23</u>	MINUTES IN CHAMBERS– ORDER RE: UNOPPOSED EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME by Judge Consuelo B. Marshall granting <u>21</u> EX PARTE APPLICATION: Before the Court is Defendants' ex parte application requesting an extension of time to answer, plead, or otherwise respond to

		Plaintiff's complaint in this action. (Dkt. No. 21.) Defense counsel indicates in a declaration that Plaintiff does not oppose the request. (Medrano Decl. 9.) Accordingly, the request is granted. Defendants' response to the complaint shall be filed no later than October 30, 2018. However, future unopposed ex parte applications will not be granted unless accompanied by a showing as to why the parties were unable to proceed by stipulation rather than ex parte application. (bm) (Entered: 09/27/2018)
10/02/2018	<u>24</u>	MINUTES OF DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT AND TO STRIKE PORTIONS OF THE COMPLAINT <u>2</u> Hearing held before Judge Consuelo B. Marshall: The case is called and counsel states her appearance. No appearance made on behalf of plaintiff. The Court and counsel confer. Defendant's Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint is GRANTED. A written order will issue. Court Reporter: Marea Woolrich. (bm) (Entered: 10/02/2018)
10/05/2018	<u>25</u>	ORDER DISMISSING CLAIM AGAINST THE LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT WITHOUT PREJUDICE [DKT. NO. 9] by Judge Consuelo B. Marshall: The Court DISMISSES Plaintiffs sole cause of action against the Los Angeles Police Department for lack for subject-matter jurisdiction. This dismissal is WITHOUT PREJUDICE to Plaintiff's refiling the claim in state court. (see document for further details) (bm) (Entered: 10/05/2018)
10/30/2018	<u>26</u>	ANSWER to Complaint – (Discovery),, <u>1</u> filed by Defendants Department of Homeland Security, Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, National Security Division, United States Attorneys Office for the Central District of California.(Medrano, Alarice) (Entered: 10/30/2018)
11/26/2018	<u>27</u>	MOTION for Summary Judgment in favor of Plaintiff for Claim 2 filed by Plaintiff Mark Hezinger. (shb) (Additional attachment(s) added on 11/27/2018: # <u>1</u> Proposed Order) (shb). (Entered: 11/27/2018)
11/26/2018	<u>28</u>	MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF PLAINTIFF FOR CLAIM 2 <u>27</u> filed by Plaintiff Mark Hezinger. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Memorandum part 2, # <u>2</u> Memorandum part 3, # <u>3</u> Memorandum part 4)(shb) (Entered: 11/27/2018)
11/26/2018	<u>29</u>	PROOF OF SERVICE filed by Plaintiff Mark Hezinger, re Memorandum in Support of Motion <u>28</u> , MOTION for Summary Judgment in favor of Plaintiff for Claim 2 <u>27</u> served on 11/26/2018. (shb) (Entered: 11/27/2018)